

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 21 are pending in the application. Claims 1 - 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1 - 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,874,042. Claims 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,346,946 issued to Jeddeloh. The status of Claim 21 is unknown. Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-21.

Applicant respectfully traverses the statutory type double patenting rejection. Statutory double patenting requires that the same invention is claimed twice, meaning identical subject matter MPEP § 804 II(A). Each of Claims 1-21 recites PCI Express, an element lacking from the 042 Patent. If the Examiner will restate the rejection as non-statutory double patenting, Applicant will submit a terminal disclaimer to address the rejection.

The Examiner rejects Claims 14-20 as obvious over Jeddeloh, however, Claim 14 is a dependent claim. Applicant requests clarification regarding the basis for the rejections of the claims. In any event, Claims 14-20 each address communication of audio information to audio processing components. Jeddeloh fails to teach, disclose or suggest communication of audio information to audio processing components; indeed, the term "audio" is absent from Jeddeloh. Accordingly, Jeddeloh cannot make obvious Claims 14-20.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on January 8, 2007.

/Robert W. Holland/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020